UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,849	01/15/2004	Christopher G. Malone	200311279-1	8762

22879 7590 03/02/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
BOLES, DEREK	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3749	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,849	MALONE, CHRISTOPHER G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Derek S. Boles	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *20-27* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 28-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *20-27* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1-19 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's information disclosure statement entry (IQ) in view of May (3,318,225). (IQ) discloses all of the limitations of the claim(s) except for a sensor communicatively coupled to the partition that detects a parameter indicative of airflow distribution and controls the flow resistance based on the parameter. May discloses the presence of a sensor communicatively coupled to the partition that detects a parameter indicative of airflow distribution and controls the flow resistance based on the parameter. See fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 1-9. Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of (IQ) to include the a sensor communicatively coupled to the partition that detects a parameter indicative of airflow distribution and controls the flow resistance based on the parameter of May for the purpose of automatic airflow distribution. Regarding claim 2, see pages 6-7 of (IQ). Regarding claim 13, see page 7 of (IQ). Regarding claim 29, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a plurality of sensors, since it has been held that mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. In *re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). Regarding claim 32, it has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted

to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

Regarding claims 5, 9, 14, 17, (IQ) in view of May discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for a network of distributed sensors, a plurality of louvered shutters in the partition and one partition's flow resistance being independently controllable. However, since the applicant has failed to establish any criticality or synergistic results which are derived from the recited configurations, these limitations are considered a matter of obvious design choice. Thus, the applicant's design configurations would have been an obvious improvement to one of ordinary skill in the art with regard to the apparatus disclosed in (IQ) in view of May.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Specifically, applicant's assertion that the cited references do not disclose "an adaptively controllable flow resistance" is not true. On page 6 of the IQ reference it is clearly stated that "airflow distribution can be modified by changing the open area of the partitions". Regarding applicant's assertion that the cited references do not disclose "a sensor...that...dynamically controls the flow resistance...to balance air flow distribution to match thermal loads imposed by data center equipment", the May, as recited above, clearly points out the presence of a sensor communicatively coupled to the partition that detects a parameter indicative of airflow distribution and controls the flow

resistance based on the parameter. See fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 1-9. Applicant's argument regarding claim 2 is also false. The IQ reference provide partitions with open areas of a certain size, these partitions are replaceable with partitions with open areas of a different size thereby rendering the open areas adjustable. Further, reading the claim language in its broadest sense the recited controller can be a person replacing the partitions.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The provided references are representative of the state of the art that is applicable to the applicant's invention. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derek S. Boles at (571) 272-4872 or supervisory patent examiner Ehud Gartenberg at (571) 272-4828.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http//pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D.S.B.

DEREK S. BOLES
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3700

2/14/06